arXiv:1702.03427v1 [math.AG] 11 Feb 2017

HIGHER-GENUS QUASIMAP WALL-CROSSING VIA LOCALIZATION

EMILY CLADER, FELIX JANDA, AND YONGBIN RUAN

Abstract. We give a new proof of Ciocan-Fontanine and Kim's wall-crossing formula relating the virtual classes of the moduli spaces of ϵ-stable quasimaps for different ϵ in any genus, whenever the target is a complete intersection in projective space and there is at least one marked point. Our techniques involve a twisted graph space, which we expect to generalize to yield wall-crossing formulas for general gauged linear sigma models.

1. Introduction

The study of quasimaps was introduced into Gromov–Witten theory several years ago by Ciocan-Fontanine, Kim, and Maulik [11, 6, 22, 24], generalizing the notion of stable maps to a GIT quotient Z. Quasimaps depend on the additional datum of a stability parameter ϵ varying over positive rational numbers. When $\epsilon \to \infty$, they coincide with ordinary stable maps and one recovers the usual Gromov–Witten theory of Z, while when $\epsilon \to 0$, quasimaps are the stable quotients defined by Marian–Oprea–Pandharipande [21]. The latter theory is thought to correspond to the mirror B-model of Z [5, 8, 9].

When ϵ varies from ∞ to 0, the theory changes only at certain discrete values, giving a wall-and-chamber structure to the space of stability parameters. In [9], Ciocan-Fontanine and Kim proved a wall-crossing formula relating the genus-zero theories for different values of ϵ. The higher-genus theory, on the other hand, is well-known to be much more difficult. Even stating the appropriate generalization of the wall-crossing formula to higher genus is a nontrivial problem. Ciocan-Fontanine and Kim carried this out in [10] and [7], yielding the following remarkable conjecture:

Conjecture 1.1 (See [10])**.** *Let Z be a complete intersection in projective space, and fix $g, n \geq 0$. Then*

$$\sum_{\beta} q^{\beta} [\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)]^{vir} =$$

$$\sum_{\beta_0,\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_k} \frac{q^{\beta_0}}{k!} b_{\vec{\beta}*} c_* \left(\prod_{i=1}^{k} q^{\beta_i} \operatorname{ev}_{n+i}^*(\mu^{\epsilon}_{\beta_i}(-\psi_{n+i})) \cap [\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\infty}_{g,n+k}(Z,\beta_0)]^{vir} \right),$$

where $\mu^{\epsilon}_{\beta}(z)$ are certain coefficients of the I-function of Z, $b_{\vec{\beta}}$ is a morphism that converts marked points to basepoints, and c is the natural contraction morphism from ∞-stable to ϵ-stable quasimaps.

More generally, let Z be a GIT quotient of the form $W /\!\!/_{\theta} G$, for W a complex affine variety and G a reductive algebraic group. Then there is an explicit formula, depending only on coefficients of the I-function of Z, that relates the virtual fundamental cycles of the moduli spaces of ϵ-stable and ∞-stable quasimaps to Z.

Ciocan-Fontanine and Kim have proven their conjecture whenever Z is a complete intersection in projective space [10], using virtual push-forward techniques and MacPherson's graph construction.

Quasimap theory is also a special case of the gauged linear sigma model (GLSM), which was recently given a mathematical definition by Fan, Jarvis, and the third author [13]. More specifically, for complete intersections Z in projective space, the GLSM has a "geometric" chamber, which recovers quasimap theory, and a "Landau–Ginzburg" chamber, which recovers Fan–Jarvis–Ruan–Witten (FJRW) theory when Z is a hypersurface. Conjecture 1.1 makes sense in both chambers, so a natural question is whether the same wall-crossing results hold on the Landau–Ginzburg side.

Our primary motivation for studying wall-crossing, in the context both of quasimaps and the Landau–Ginzburg model, is the celebrated Landau–Ginzburg/Calabi–Yau (LG/CY) correspondence. When Z is a hypersurface, the LG/CY correspondence proposes an explicit connection between Gromov–Witten and FJRW theory, while for more general targets, it can be viewed as a wall-crossing (or "phase transition") between the different chambers of the GLSM. In contrast to the wall-crossing expressed by Conjecture 1.1, phase transition between chambers involves analytic continuation of generating functions, a much more subtle operation. Our ultimate goal is to prove the LG/CY correspondence via a series of wall-crossings, first from $\epsilon = \infty$ to $\epsilon = 0$ in the geometric chamber, then across the chamber wall, and finally from $\epsilon = 0$ to $\epsilon = \infty$ in the Landau–Ginzburg chamber. This strategy

has already been carried out in genus zero for hypersurfaces (through a combination of Ciocan-Fontanine–Kim's wall-crossing [9], work of Ross and the third author on the Landau–Ginzburg side [23], and analytic continuation by Chiodo and the third author [4]), as well as in genus one for the quintic hypersurface without marked points (by combining the quasimap mirror theorem of Kim–Lho [20] with the work of Guo–Ross [18, 19]).

In ongoing research [12], we are working on proving the analogue of Conjecture 1.1 for the higher-genus Landau–Ginzburg theory of the quintic threefold. Our techniques are entirely different from Ciocan-Fontanine–Kim's strategy in the geometric phase: we construct a larger moduli space (the "twisted graph space") with a $\mathbb{C}^*$-action, in which the theories at $\epsilon = \infty$ and at arbitrary ϵ arise as fixed loci. This larger moduli space is closely related to the space of mixed-spin p-fields considered by Chang–Li–Li–Liu [2, 3]; indeed, the two spaces represent different chambers of the same GIT quotient.

Higher-genus Landau–Ginzburg theory, however, is subject to certain technical issues regarding the decomposition of cosection-localized virtual cycles, and these issues have delayed the completion of [12]. Since no such complications arise in the geometric chamber, and the same techniques for proving the wall-crossing apply, the current paper presents our strategy in that setting. The result is a new proof of Ciocan-Fontanine–Kim's wall-crossing theorem for complete intersections in projective space, assuming the existence of at least one marked point:[1]

Theorem 1.2. *(See Theorem 2.6) Conjecture 1.1 holds whenever Z is a complete intersection in projective space and $n \geq 1$.*

1.1. **Plan of the paper.** In Section 2, we review the necessary definitions from quasimap theory and state Theorem 1.2 in precise form. We introduce the twisted graph space in Section 3, and we explicitly compute the contributions to the localization formula from each of its $\mathbb{C}^*$-fixed loci. Specializing to the case where Z is a point, the twisted graph space is simply $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}(\mathbb{P}^1, d)$, and in Section 4, we study that case in detail. Finally, in Section 5, we turn to the proof of Theorem 1.2. The idea is to compute, via localization, the pushforward from the twisted graph space to $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z, \beta)$ of a certain difference of cohomology classes. Using the computations of the previous section (which are

[1]Our proof crucially uses that the localization expression for the virtual cycle of the twisted graph space changes in a nontrivial way when the insertions vary, which is why we require the existence of at least one marked point. See Remark 5.2 for further discussion.

closely related to the contribution to the localization from degree-zero components), we conclude that this difference changes by an irrational function of the equivariant parameter when an insertion is varied. This implies that the difference must vanish, and the wall-crossing theorem follows.

1.2. **Acknowledgments.** The notion of a twisted graph space containing ϵ-theory and ∞-theory as fixed loci owes an intellectual debt to a number of people. In particular, the idea that such a space should exist was first mentioned to us by Ionuţ Ciocan-Fontanine, and the space that we define below is related by phase transition to Chang–Li–Li–Liu's moduli space of mixed-spin p-fields [2, 3]. We thank all of these authors for their crucial help in inspiring our construction. We are also grateful to Bumsig Kim and Dustin Ross for many useful conversations and comments.

The first author acknowledges the generous support of Dr. Max Rössler, the Walter Haefner Foundation, and the ETH Foundation. The second author was partially supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation grant SNF 200021_143274, and the CNRS. The third author was partially supported by NSF grant DMS 1405245 and NSF FRG grant DMS 1159265 .

2. Definitions and setup

Fix a collection of homogeneous polynomials

$$W_1, \dots, W_r \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_{N+1}]$$

of degrees $d_1, \dots, d_r$ defining a complete intersection $Z \subset \mathbb{P}^N$. In this section, we review the relevant definitions regarding quasimaps to Z. All of these ideas are due to Ciocan-Fontanine, Kim, and Maulik, and we refer the reader to their work for details.

2.1. **Quasimaps and their moduli.** A moduli space of quasimaps depends on the presentation of Z as a GIT quotient. In our case, we write

$$Z = [AZ /\!\!/_\theta \, \mathbb{C}^*],$$

where AZ denotes the affine cone over Z:

$$AZ = \{W_1 = \cdots = W_r = 0\} \subset \mathbb{C}^{N+1}.$$

The $\mathbb{C}^*$-action on AZ is induced by the $\mathbb{C}^*$-action on $\mathbb{C}^{N+1}$ with weights $(1, \dots, 1)$, and the character $\theta \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{C}^*, \mathbb{C}^*) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ is positive. We use $(x_1, \dots, x_{N+1})$ to denote the coordinates on $\mathbb{C}^{N+1}$.

For each genus $g \geq 0$, nonnegative integer n, and positive rational number ϵ, quasimaps are defined as follows:

Definition 2.1. An *ϵ-stable quasimap* to Z consists of an n-pointed prestable curve $(C; q_1, \dots, q_n)$ of genus g, a line bundle L on C, and a section

$$\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{N+1}) \in \Gamma(L^{\oplus N+1}),$$

subject to the following conditions:

- *Image*: The sections $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{N+1})$ satisfy the equations

$$W_1(\vec{x}) = 0 \in \Gamma(L^{\otimes d_1}), \ \dots, \ W_r(\vec{x}) = 0 \in \Gamma(L^{\otimes d_r}). \tag{1}$$

- *Nondegeneracy*: The zero set of $\vec{x}$ is finite and disjoint from the marked points and nodes of C, and for each zero q of $\vec{x}$, the order of the zero (that is, the common order of vanishing of $x_1, \dots, x_{N+1}$) satisfies

$$\mathrm{ord}_q(\vec{x}) \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon}. \tag{2}$$

  (Zeroes of $\vec{x}$ are referred to as *basepoints* of the quasi-map.)
- *Stability*: The $\mathbb{Q}$-line bundle

$$L^{\otimes \epsilon} \otimes \omega_{\log} \tag{3}$$

  is ample.

The *degree* of the quasimap is defined as $\beta := \deg(L)$.

Note that for $\epsilon > 2$, condition (2) implies that $x_1, \dots, x_{N+1}$ have no common zeroes, so $\vec{x}$ defines a map $C \to \mathbb{P}^N$. Condition (3) says that this map is stable, and condition (1) says that it lands in the complete intersection Z. Thus, the definition of ϵ-stable quasimap recovers the notion of a stable map to Z in this case. To emphasize their role in the more general theory, we refer to stable maps as ∞-stable quasimaps in what follows.

For $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{\beta}$, on the other hand, condition (2) puts no restriction on the orders of the basepoints, and (3) is equivalent to imposing the analogous requirement for all $\epsilon > 0$. The resulting objects are stable quotients [21], which are sometimes referred to as (0+)-stable quasimaps.

Remark 2.2. An alternative way to view the choice of stability parameter ϵ is to replace the choice of character $\theta \in \mathrm{Hom}_Z(\mathbb{C}^*, \mathbb{C}^*)$ in the GIT quotient by a choice of rational character— that is, $\theta \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{C}^*, \mathbb{C}^*) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q} \cong \mathbb{Q}$. This perspective is useful in what follows.

The first key foundational result about quasimaps is the following:

Theorem 2.3 (Ciocan-Fontanine–Kim–Maulik [11])**.** *There is a proper, separated Deligne–Mumford stack $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z, \beta)$ parameterizing genus-g, n-pointed, ϵ-stable quasimaps of degree β to Z up to isomorphism.*

Moreover, in [11, Section 4.5], Ciocan-Fontanine, Kim, and Maulik exhibit a perfect obstruction theory on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)$ relative to the stack $\mathcal{D}_{g,n,\beta}$ of curves equipped with a line bundle of degree β. This can be used to define a virtual cycle

$$[\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)]^{\mathrm{vir}} \in A_{\mathrm{vdim}}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)),$$

where

$$\mathrm{vdim}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)) = (N-r-3)(1-g) + \int_{\beta} c_1(T_Z) + n.$$

Remark 2.4. In genus zero, the definition of the virtual cycle simplifies substantially. Indeed, the genus-zero virtual cycle is simply the Euler class of a vector bundle; this is exactly analogous to the situation for stable maps.

There are evaluation maps

$$\mathrm{ev}_i : \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta) \to Z$$

for each $i = 1, \ldots, n$, since the basepoints of $\vec{x}$ do not occur at marked points. Futhermore, psi classes $\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n$ can be defined just as in the usual theory of stable maps. Using these, one can define quasimap correlators by analogy to the usual Gromov–Witten invariants. We denote

$$\mathcal{H} := H^*(Z;\mathbb{C}),$$

which is the state space of the theory (that is, the vector space from which insertions to the correlators are drawn), and

$$H := c_1(\mathcal{O}_Z(1)),$$

the hyperplane class.

2.2. **The J-function.** The small J-function for ϵ-stable quasimap theory was defined by Ciocan-Fontanine and Kim in [9], generalizing its original definition by Givental [15, 16, 14] in Gromov–Witten theory and building on the interpretation in terms of contraction maps due to Bertram [1]. We recall their definition below.

Let $\mathcal{G}\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{0,k}(Z,\beta)$ denote a "graph space" version of the moduli space $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{0,k}(Z,\beta)$. That is, $\mathcal{G}\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{0,k}(Z,\beta)$ parameterizes the same data as the original moduli space, together with the additional datum of a degree-1 map $C \to \mathbb{P}^1$ (or equivalently, a parametrization of one component of C), and the ampleness condition (3) is not required on the parameterized component. Denote the parameterized component by $C_0 \cong \mathbb{P}^1$, with coordinates $[z_1 : z_2]$. Let $\mathbb{C}^*$ act on $\mathcal{G}\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{0,1}(Z,\beta)$ by multiplication on z_2, and let z denote the weight at the tangent space of $0 \in \mathbb{P}^1$.

The fixed loci of this action consist of quasimaps for which all of marked points and basepoints and the entire degree β is concentrated over 0 and ∞ in C_0. We denote by $F_\beta^\epsilon \subset \mathcal{G}\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,k}^\epsilon(Z,\beta)$ the fixed locus on which everything is concentrated over 0. More precisely, when $k \geq 1$ or $\beta > 1/\epsilon$, an element of F_β^ϵ consists of an ϵ-stable quasimap to Z attached at a single marked point to C_0, so

$$F_\beta^\epsilon \cong \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,k+1}^\epsilon(Z,\beta).$$

When $k = 0$ and $\beta \leq 1/\epsilon$, on the other hand, such a quasimap would not be stable; instead, C_0 is the entire source curve, and the quasimap has a single basepoint of order β at 0. In either case, there is an evaluation map

$$\mathrm{ev}_\bullet : F_\beta^\epsilon \to Z,$$

defined by evaluation at $\infty \in C_0$.

Following [9], we define:

Definition 2.5. Let q be a formal Novikov variable. The *ϵ-stable J-function* is defined by

$$J^\epsilon(q,\mathbf{t},z) := z \sum_{k\geq 0,\beta\geq 0} q^\beta (\mathrm{ev}_\bullet)_* \left(\frac{\prod_{i=1}^k \mathrm{ev}_i^*(\mathbf{t}(\psi_i))}{k!} \cap \frac{[F_\beta^\epsilon]^{\mathrm{vir}}}{e_{\mathbb{C}^*}\left(N^{\mathrm{vir}}_{F_\beta^\epsilon/\mathcal{G}\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,k}^\epsilon(Z,\beta)}\right)} \right),$$

where $\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{H}[\![z]\!]$. (Note that our convention differs by an overall factor of z from [9].)

The *small ϵ-stable J-function* is

$$J^\epsilon(q,\mathbf{t}=0,z) =: J^\epsilon(q,z).$$

More explicitly, we have

$$J^\epsilon(q,z) = z + \sum_{\beta>1/\epsilon} q^\beta (\mathrm{ev}_\bullet)_* \left(\frac{[\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,\bullet}^\epsilon(Z,\beta)]^{\mathrm{vir}}}{z-\psi_\bullet} \right) + \text{unstable terms}.$$

The "unstable terms" are the terms with $\beta \leq 1/\epsilon$, and can be computed explicitly, as explained in [1]. In particular, taking $\epsilon \to 0+$ (that is, requiring the stability condition (3) for all $\epsilon > 0$), every term of the J-function becomes unstable, and one obtains a function $I(q,z) = J^{0+}(q,z)$ that can be calculated exactly. This is the I-function of Z, as studied by Givental [16] and many others:

$$I(q,z) = z \sum_{\beta\geq 0} q^\beta \frac{\prod_{i=1}^r \prod_{b=1}^{d_i\beta}(d_iH+bz)}{\prod_{b=1}^\beta (H+bz)^{N+1}}. \tag{4}$$

More generally, truncating (4) to powers of q less than or equal to $1/\beta$ yields the unstable part of J^ϵ for any ϵ.

We denote by

$$[J^\epsilon]_+(q,z) \in \mathcal{H}[\![q,z]\!]$$

the part of the J-function with non-negative powers of z, and we let $\mu^\epsilon_\beta(z)$ denote the q^β-coefficient in $-z\mathbf{1} + [J]^\epsilon_+(q,z)$:

$$\sum_\beta q^\beta \mu^\epsilon_\beta(z) = -z\mathbf{1} + [J^\epsilon]_+(q,z) = O(q).$$

This is sometimes referred to as the "mirror transformation."

2.3. **The wall-crossing conjecture.** The wall-crossing conjecture in genus zero states that the function $J^\epsilon(q,z)$ lies on the Lagrangian cone of the Gromov–Witten theory of Z, or in other words, that there exists $\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{H}[\![z]\!]$ such that $J^\epsilon(q,z) = J^\infty(q,\mathbf{t},z)$. More explicitly, the requisite $\mathbf{t}$ is determined by the fact that $J^\infty(q,\mathbf{t},z) = z\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{t}(-z) + O(z^{-1})$, so the fact that $J^\epsilon(q,z) = J^\infty(q,\mathbf{t},z)$ says that

$$J^\epsilon(q,z) = J^\infty\left(q, z\mathbf{1} + [J^\epsilon]_+(q,-z), z\right) = J^\infty\left(q, \sum_\beta q^\beta \mu^\epsilon_\beta(-z), z\right).$$

Thus, the genus-zero wall-crossing conjecture can be rephrased as the agreement of the functions J^ϵ and J^∞ up to a shift by the mirror transformation.

More generally, the wall-crossing conjecture in any genus can be stated on the level of virtual cycles. To do so, we require a bit more notation. For a tuple of nonnegative integers $\vec{\beta} = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k)$, there is a morphism

$$b_{\vec{\beta}} : \overline{\mathcal{M}}^\epsilon_{g,n+k}\left(Z, \beta - \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i\right) \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}^\epsilon_{g,n}(Z,\beta)$$

that "trades" the last k marked points for basepoints of orders $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k$. Furthermore, there is a morphism

$$c : \overline{\mathcal{M}}^\infty_{g,n}(Z,\beta) \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}^\epsilon_{g,n}(Z,\beta)$$

that contracts rational tails and replaces them with basepoints. See [9, Sections 3.1 and 3.2] and [10, Section 1.4] for more careful definitions.

We are now ready to state our main theorem, a verification of the all-genus wall-crossing conjecture, in precise form:

Theorem 2.6. *Let Z be a complete intersection in projective space, and fix $g \geq 0$ and $n \geq 1$ such that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)$ is nonempty. Then*

$$\sum_{\beta} q^{\beta} [\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)]^{vir} =$$

$$\sum_{\beta_0,\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_k} \frac{q^{\beta_0}}{k!} b_{\vec{\beta}*} c_* \left(\prod_{i=1}^{k} q^{\beta_i} \operatorname{ev}_{n+i}^*(\mu^{\epsilon}_{\beta_i}(-\psi_{n+i})) \cap [\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\infty}_{g,n+k}(Z,\beta_0)]^{vir} \right).$$

Remark 2.7. As explained in [10, Corollary 1.5], Theorem 2.6 implies a comparison of the genus-g generating functions of ϵ-theory and ∞-theory with $n \geq 1$.

Remark 2.8. An analogue of Theorem 2.6 makes sense for general GLSMs, and we expect that our proof can be adapted to this more general setting.

2.4. **Twisted theory.** Our proof of Theorem 2.6 requires a generalization of the theory of ϵ-stable quasimaps, defined via a twist by an equivariant Euler class.

Let

$$\pi : \mathcal{C} \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)$$

denote the universal curve, and let $\mathcal{L}$ denote the universal line bundle on $\mathcal{C}$. Consider a trivial $\mathbb{C}^*$-action on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)$, lifted to an action scaling the fibers of $R\pi_*(\mathcal{L}^{\vee})$ with weight -1. We write $\mathbb{C}_{(\lambda)}$ for a nonequivariantly trivial line bundle with a $\mathbb{C}^*$-action of weight 1, where λ denotes the equivariant parameter of the action. To distinguish this action from the one on the graph space we write $\mathbb{C}^*$ as $\mathbb{C}^*_{\lambda}$.

Define

$$[\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)]^{\mathrm{vir}}_{\mathrm{tw}} := \frac{[\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)]^{\mathrm{vir}}}{e_{\mathbb{C}^*_{\lambda}}\left(R\pi_*(\mathcal{L}^{\vee}) \otimes \mathbb{C}_{(\lambda)}\right)}.$$

There is a twisted J-function, defined by replacing the virtual class by its twisted analogue:

$$J^{\epsilon}_{\mathrm{tw}}(q,z) := \sum_{\beta} q^{\beta} (\mathrm{ev}_{\bullet})_* \left(\frac{[\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{0,\bullet}(Z,\beta)]^{\mathrm{vir}} \cap e_{\mathbb{C}^*_{\lambda}\times\mathbb{C}^*_z}\left(-R\pi_*(\mathcal{L}^{\vee}) \otimes \mathbb{C}_{(\lambda)}\right)}{e_{\mathbb{C}^*_z}(N_{F_\beta})} \right).$$

Here, $\mathbb{C}^*_z$ denote the $\mathbb{C}^*$-action on the z_2-coordinate of the graph space. From the twisted J-function we define the twisted mirror transformation:

$$\sum_{\beta} q^{\beta} \mu^{\epsilon,\mathrm{tw}}_{\beta}(z) = -\mathbf{1}z + [J^{\epsilon}_{\mathrm{tw}}(z)]_+. \tag{5}$$

In genus zero, there is again a wall-crossing conjecture of the form

$$J^{\epsilon}_{\mathrm{tw}}(q,z) = J^{\infty}_{\mathrm{tw}}\left(q, \sum_{\beta} q^{\beta}\mu^{\epsilon,\mathrm{tw}}_{\beta}(-z), z\right). \tag{6}$$

In our situation, (6) has been proven in [9, Corollary 7.3.2].

Equipped with these definitions, we can state a twisted wall-crossing theorem, in direct analogy to Theorem 2.6:

Theorem 2.9. *Let Z be a complete intersection in projective space, and fix $g \geq 0$, $n \geq 1$ such that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)$ is nonempty. Then*

$$\sum_{\beta} q^{\beta}[\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)]^{vir}_{tw} =$$

$$\sum_{\beta_0,\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_k} \frac{q^{\beta_0}}{k!} b_{\vec{\beta}*} c_* \left(\prod_{i=1}^{k} q^{\beta_i} \operatorname{ev}^*_{n+i}(\mu^{\epsilon,tw}_{\beta_i}(-\psi_{n+i})) \cap [\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\infty}_{g,n+k}(Z,\beta_0)]^{vir}_{tw} \right).$$

The key point, now, is the following:

Lemma 2.10. *The twisted wall-crossing theorem (Theorem 2.9) implies the untwisted wall-crossing theorem (Theorem 2.6).*

Proof. For each β, the coefficients of q^{β} on the two sides of Theorem 2.9 are Laurent polynomials in the equivariant parameter λ. Then

$$[\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)]^{\mathrm{vir}}_{tw} = \sum_{i \leq g-1-\beta} \lambda^i C_i \cap [\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)]^{\mathrm{vir}}$$

for nonequivariant classes $C_i \in H^{g-1-\beta-i}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta))$ for which the top coefficient is $C_{g-1-\beta} = \mathbf{1}$.

The untwisted wall-crossing follows from Theorem 2.9 by taking the coefficient of $\lambda^{g-1-\beta}$ on both sides: the left-hand side directly yields $[\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)]^{\mathrm{vir}}$, while the only contribution on the right-hand side comes from taking the top power of λ in every factor of $\mu^{\epsilon,\mathrm{tw}}$ and in $[\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\infty}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)]^{\mathrm{vir}}_{\mathrm{tw}}$, thus producing the right-hand side of Theorem 2.6. □

3. Twisted graph space

The proof of Theorem 2.6 proceeds by $\mathbb{C}^*$-localization on an enhanced version $\mathbb{P}Z^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta,d}$ of the moduli space of ϵ-stable quasimaps. We refer to it as the "twisted graph space", due to its resemblance to the graph space described in Section 2.2. Its key feature is that quasimaps landing at one fixed point are ϵ-stable and quasimaps landing at the other fixed point are ∞-stable.

3.1. **Definition of the twisted graph space.** The twisted graph space consists of quasimaps to the projectivization of the vector bundle $\mathcal{O}_Z(-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}_Z$ on Z, which is the GIT quotient

$$\mathbb{P}Z := (AZ \times \mathbb{C}^2) /\!\!/_\theta \, (\mathbb{C}^*)^2,$$

in which AZ again denotes the affine cone over Z, the action of $(\mathbb{C}^*)^2$ is

$$(g,t) \cdot (\vec{x}, z_1, z_2) = (g\vec{x}, g^{-1}tz_1, tz_2),$$

and the (rational) character $\theta : (\mathbb{C}^*)^2 \to \mathbb{C}^*$ is

$$\theta(g,t) = g^\epsilon t^3.$$

(See Remark 2.2 above for the meaning of a GIT quotient with rational character.)

In more concrete terms, we have

$$\mathbb{P}Z^\epsilon_{g,n,\beta,d} = \{(C; q_1, \dots, q_n; L_1, L_2, \sigma) | \dots\} / \sim,$$

where $(C; q_1, \dots, q_n)$ is an n-pointed prestable curve of genus g, L_1 and L_2 are line bundles on C with

$$\beta = \deg(L_1), \quad d = \deg(L_2),$$

and

$$\sigma \in \Gamma(L_1^{\oplus N+1} \oplus (L_1^\vee \otimes L_2) \oplus L_2).$$

We denote the components of σ by $(\vec{x}, z_1, z_2)$. The following conditions are required:

- *Image*: The sections $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{N+1})$ satisfy the equations
$$W_1(\vec{x}) = 0 \in \Gamma(L^{\otimes d_1}), \dots, W_r(\vec{x}) = 0 \in \Gamma(L^{\otimes d_r}).$$
- *Nondegeneracy*[2]: The sections z_1 and z_2 never simultaneously vanish. Furthermore, for each point q of C at which $z_2(q) \neq 0$, we have
$$\mathrm{ord}_q(\vec{x}) \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon},$$
and for each point q of C at which $z_2(q) = 0$ (and hence $z_1(q) \neq 0$), we have
$$\mathrm{ord}_q(\vec{x}) = 0.$$
- *Stability*: The $\mathbb{Q}$-line bundle
$$L_1^\epsilon \otimes L_2^{\otimes 3} \otimes \omega_{\log}$$
is ample.

[2]The nondegeneracy condition here, though cumbersome to write down, is simply the explicit statement of the length condition appearing in [8, Section 2.1].

There are natural evaluation maps

$$\mathrm{ev}_i : \mathbb{P}Z^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta,d} \to \mathbb{P}Z,$$

given, as before, by evaluating the sections $\vec{x}$ at q_i. Moreover, since $\mathbb{P}Z^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta,d}$ is a moduli space of stable quasimaps to a lci GIT quotient, the results of [11] imply that it is a proper Deligne–Mumford stack equipped with a natural perfect obstruction theory relative to the stack $\mathcal{D}_{g,n,\beta,d}$ of curves equipped with a pair of line bundles. This obstruction theory is of the form

$$R\pi_*(u^*\mathbb{R}\mathbb{T}_\rho). \tag{7}$$

Here, we denote the universal family over $\mathbb{P}Z^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta,d}$ by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{V} & \overset{u}{\underset{\rho}{\rightleftarrows}} & \mathcal{C} \\ & & \downarrow \pi \\ & & \mathbb{P}Z^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta,d}, \end{array}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ are the universal line bundles and

$$\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{L}_1^{\oplus N+1} \oplus (\mathcal{L}_1^\vee \otimes \mathcal{L}_2) \oplus \mathcal{L}_2$$

is the subsheaf of sections taking values in the affine cone of Z. Somewhat more explicitly, (7) equals

$$\mathbb{E} \oplus R\pi_*((\mathcal{L}_1^\vee \otimes \mathcal{L}_2) \oplus \mathcal{L}_2), \tag{8}$$

in which the sub-obstruction-theory $\mathbb{E}$ comes from the deformations and obstructions of the sections $\vec{x}$.

The virtual dimension of $\mathbb{P}Z^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta,d}$ is equal to

$$\mathrm{vdim}(\mathbb{P}Z^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta,d}) = \mathrm{vdim}(Z^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta}) + 2d - \beta + 1 - g.$$

3.2. **$\mathbb{C}^*$-action and fixed loci.** Let $\mathbb{C}^*$ act on $\mathbb{P}Z^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta,d}$ with weight -1 on the z_1-coordinate of σ. Denote by λ the equivariant parameter[3] of this action, defined as the tangent weight at $0 \in \mathbb{P}^1$.

Analogously to the graph space $\mathcal{G}\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{0,n}(Z,\beta)$, as well as to the well-known situation in Gromov–Witten theory, the fixed loci of the $\mathbb{C}^*$-action on $\mathbb{P}Z^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta,d}$ are indexed by certain decorated graphs. A graph Γ consists of vertices, edges, and n legs, with the following decorations:

- Each vertex v is decorated by an index $j(v) \in \{0, \infty\}$, a genus $g(v)$, and a degree $\beta(v) \in \mathbb{N}$.
- Each edge e is decorated by a degree $d(e) \in \mathbb{N}$.

[3]The localization computations that follow show that this use of λ is consistent with Section 2.4.

- Each leg is decorated by an element of $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$.

The valence $\mathrm{val}(v)$ of a vertex v denotes the total number of incident legs and half-edges.

The fixed locus in $\mathbb{P}Z^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta,d}$ indexed by the decorated graph Γ parameterizes quasi-maps of the following type:

- Each edge e corresponds to a genus-zero component C_e on which

$$\deg(L_2|_{C_e}) = d(e),$$

  z_1 and z_2 each vanish at exactly one point (the "ramification points" of C_e), and all of the marked points, all of the nodes, and all of the degree of $L_1|_{C_e}$ is concentrated at the ramification points. That is,

$$\deg(L_1|_{C_e}) = \sum_{q \in C_e} \mathrm{ord}_q(\vec{x}),$$

  so if both ramification points are special points, it follows that $\deg(L_1|_{C_e}) = 0$.
- Each vertex v for which $j(v) = 0$ (with certain unstable exceptional cases noted below) corresponds to a maximal sub-curve C_v of C over which $z_1 \equiv 0$, and each vertex v for which $j(v) = \infty$ (again with some exceptions) corresponds to a maximal sub-curve over which $z_2 \equiv 0$. The label $g(v)$ denotes the genus of C_v, the label $\beta(v)$ denotes the degree of $L_1|_{C_v}$, and the legs incident to v indicate the marked points on C_v.
- A vertex v is unstable if stable quasi-maps of the type described above do not exist. In this case, v corresponds to a single point of the component C_e for each adjacent edge e, which may be a node at which C_e meets $C_{e'}$, a marked point of C_e, or a basepoint on C_e of order $\beta(v)$.

Observe that for a stable vertex v such that $j(v) = 0$, we have $z_1|_{C_v} \equiv 0$, so the nondegeneracy condition implies that $\mathrm{ord}_q(\vec{x}) < 1/\epsilon$ for each $q \in C_v$. That is, the restriction of $(C; q_1, \ldots, q_n; L_1; \vec{x})$ to C_v defines an element of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g(v),\mathrm{val}(v)}(Z, \beta(v))$. On the other hand, for a stable vertex v such that $j(v) = \infty$, we $z_2|_{C_v} \equiv 0$, so the non-degeneracy condition implies that $\vec{x}$ is nowhere-vanishing on C_v. Thus, the restriction of $(C; q_1, \ldots, q_n; L_1; \vec{x})$ to C_v defines an element of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\infty}_{g(v),\mathrm{val}(v)}(Z, \beta(v))$. Finally, for an edge e, the restriction of $\vec{x}$ to C_e defines a constant map to Z (possibly with an additional basepoint at the ramification point where $z_1 = 0$).

Denote by F_Γ the moduli space

$$\prod_{\substack{v \text{ stable} \\ j(v)=0}} \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g(v),\mathrm{val}(v)}(Z,\beta(v)) \times_Z \prod_{\text{edges } e} Z \times_Z \prod_{\substack{v \text{ stable} \\ j(v)=\infty}} \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\infty}_{g(v),\mathrm{val}(v)}(Z,\beta(v)),$$

in which the fiber product over Z imposes that the evaluation maps at the two branches of each node agree. Then the discussion of the previous paragraph implies that there is a canonical family of $\mathbb{C}^*$-fixed elements of $\mathbb{P}Z^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta,d}$ over F_Γ, yielding a morphism

$$\iota_\Gamma : F_\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}Z^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta,d}.$$

This is not exactly the inclusion of the associated fixed locus, because elements of $\mathbb{P}Z^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta,d}$ have additional automorphisms from permuting the components C_v via an automorphism of Γ and scaling the components C_e by $d(e)$th roots of unity. Nevertheless, there is a finite map from F_Γ to the fixed locus whose degree can be explicitly calculated, and this is sufficient for our purposes.

3.3. **Localization contributions.** The virtual localization formula of Graber–Pandharipande [17] expresses $[\mathbb{P}Z^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta,d}]^{\mathrm{vir}}$ in terms of contributions from each fixed-locus graph Γ:

$$[\mathbb{P}Z^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta,d}]^{\mathrm{vir}} = \sum_\Gamma \frac{1}{|\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)| \prod_e d(e)} \iota_{\Gamma *} \left(\frac{[F_\Gamma]^{\mathrm{vir}}}{e(N_\Gamma^{\mathrm{vir}})} \right). \tag{9}$$

Here, $[F_\Gamma]^{\mathrm{vir}}$ is computed via the $\mathbb{C}^*$-fixed part of the restriction to the fixed locus of the obstruction theory on $\mathbb{P}Z^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta,d}$, and N_Γ^{vir} as the Euler class of the $\mathbb{C}^*$-moving part of this restriction.

The goal of this subsection is to compute the contributions of each graph Γ explicitly. In order to compute the contribution of a graph Γ to (9), one must first apply the normalization exact sequence to the relative obstruction theory (8), thus breaking the contribution of Γ to (9) into vertex, edge, and node factors. This accounts for all but the automorphisms and deformations within $\mathcal{D}_{g,n,\beta,d}$. The latter come from deformations of the vertex components and their line bundles, deformations of the edge components and their line bundles, and deformations smoothing the nodes; these are included in the vertex, edge, and node contributions, respectively, in what follows. We include the factors from automorphisms of the source curve also in the edge contributions.

3.3.1. *Vertex contributions.* A stable vertex v for which $j(v) = 0$ corresponds to a sub-curve C_v on which L_1 has degree $\beta(v) \geq 0$ and $L_2 \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_v}$, so z_2 is a constant section. The sections $\vec{x}$ are $\mathbb{C}^*$-fixed,

and the deformations of these sections, together with the deformations of C_v and the line bundle $L_1|_{C_v}$, contribute the virtual cycle $[\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g(v),\mathrm{val}(v)}(Z,\beta(v))]^{\mathrm{vir}}$ on the vertex moduli.

The section z_1 of $L_1^\vee \otimes L_2 \cong L_1^\vee$, on the other hand, is not $\mathbb{C}^*$-fixed, but has a $\mathbb{C}^*$-action of weight -1. Thus, each such vertex contributes

$$\frac{[\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g(v),\mathrm{val}(v)}(Z,\beta(v))]^{\mathrm{vir}}}{e^{\mathbb{C}^*}\left(R\pi_*(\mathcal{L}^\vee)\otimes\mathbb{C}_{(\lambda)}\right)}$$

to $[F_\Gamma]^{\mathrm{vir}}/e(N_\Gamma^{\mathrm{vir}})$, where $\mathcal{L}$ is the universal line bundle and $\mathbb{C}_{(\lambda)}$ denotes a nonequivariantly trivial line bundle with $\mathbb{C}^*$-action of weight 1.

A stable vertex v for which $j(v)=\infty$ corresponds to a sub-curve C_v on which $L_1 \cong L_2$ and L_2 has degree $\beta(v)\geq 0$. As above, the deformations of $\vec{x}$ and $L_1|_{C_v}$ contribute the virtual cycle. One can take $z_1 \in \Gamma(L_1^\vee \otimes L_2) \cong \Gamma(\mathcal{O}_{C_v})$ to be a constant section, but then the $\mathbb{C}^*$-scaling of z_1 must be undone by an automorphism scaling the fibers of L_2 with weight -1. Thus, such a vertex contributes

$$\frac{[\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\infty}_{g(v),\mathrm{val}(v)}(Z,\beta(v))]^{\mathrm{vir}}}{e^{\mathbb{C}^*}\left(R\pi_*(\mathcal{L})\otimes\mathbb{C}_{(-\lambda)}\right)},$$

where, again, $\mathcal{L}=f^*\mathcal{O}(1)$ denotes the universal line bundle on the moduli space $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\infty}_{g(v),\mathrm{val}(v)}(Z,\beta(v))$ of stable maps $f: C\to Z$.

3.3.2. *Edge contributions.* Consider an edge C_e that has a special point at each of its ramification points. Then the edge moduli in F_Γ is Z, parameterized by the image of the constant morphism induced by $\vec{x}$. The universal family over this edge moduli space is

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}_e := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_Z(-1)\oplus\mathcal{O}_Z) & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_Z(-1)\oplus\mathcal{O}_Z) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi} & & \\ \overline{\mathcal{M}}_e := Z, & & \end{array} \tag{10}$$

where f is given in coordinates on the $\mathbb{P}^1$ fibers by the map $[x:y]\mapsto[x^{d(e)}:y^{d(e)}]$. The universal line bundles are

$$\mathcal{L}_1 := \pi^*\mathcal{O}_Z(1)$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}_2 := f^*\mathcal{O}(1) = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}_e}(d(e)).$$

Thus, the universal section ζ_1 of $\mathcal{L}_1^\vee\otimes\mathcal{L}_2$ has

$$\zeta_1 \in \Gamma\big(\pi^*\mathcal{O}_Z(-1)\otimes\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}_e}(d(e))\big)$$

and is acted on by $\mathbb{C}^*$ with weight -1, while the universal section ζ_2 of $\mathcal{L}_2$ has

$$\zeta_2 \in \Gamma\big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}_e}(d(e))\big)$$

and is acted on trivially by $\mathbb{C}^*$.

For each point $\xi \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_e$, one can choose a local section s of $\pi^*\mathcal{O}_Z(1)$, defined in a neighborhood of $\pi^{-1}(\xi)$, that is the pullback under π of a nowhere-zero local section of $\mathcal{O}_Z(1)$. Thus, $s \cdot \zeta_1$ is a local section of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}_e}(d(e))$ vanishing only along the zero section of $\mathcal{C}_e$. In particular, if x and y are local sections of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}_e}(1)$ that define the coordinates on the $\mathbb{P}^1$ fibers of $\mathcal{C}_e$, then s can be chosen such that

$$x^{d(e)} = s \cdot \zeta_1, \quad y^{d(e)} = \zeta_2.$$

Equipped with these coordinates, we are ready to describe the contribution of the edge e. There are no infinitesimal deformations of C_e or the line bundles $L_1|_{C_e}$ and $L_2|_{C_e}$, since C_e is rational. The deformations of the sections $\vec{x}$ are fixed, so they contribute the virtual class, which is simply $[Z]$. As for the deformations of z_1, we note that sections of $\mathcal{L}_2$ are spanned by monomials $x^a y^b$ with $a + b = d(e)$. This gives a decomposition of $R\pi_*(\mathcal{L}_2)$ as a direct sum of line bundles whose first Chern classes, by the discussion in the previous paragraph, are

$$\frac{a}{d(e)}(H - \lambda),$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} e(R\pi_*(\mathcal{L}_1^\vee \otimes \mathcal{L}_2 \otimes \mathbb{C}_{(\lambda)})) &= e\Big(\big(\mathcal{O}_Z(-1) \otimes \mathbb{C}_{(\lambda)}\big) \otimes R\pi_*(\mathcal{L}_2)\Big) \\ &= \prod_{a=0}^{d(e)} \left(-H + \lambda + \frac{a}{d(e)}(H - \lambda)\right). \end{aligned}$$

After throwing away the factor that yields a zero weight, we find

$$e\left(\big(R\pi_*(\mathcal{L}_1^\vee \otimes \mathcal{L}_2 \otimes \mathbb{C}_{(\lambda)})\big)^{\mathrm{mov}}\right) = \prod_{b=1}^{d(e)} \left(\frac{b}{d(e)}(\lambda - H)\right), \tag{11}$$

which is the contribution of deformations of z_1 to the Euler class of the virtual normal bundle. A similar computation shows that deformations of z_2 contribute

$$e(R\pi_*(\mathcal{L}_2)^{\mathrm{mov}}) = \prod_{b=1}^{d(e)} \left(-\frac{b}{d(e)}(\lambda - H)\right) \tag{12}$$

to the Euler class of the virtual normal bundle. The zero-weight factors that we have eliminated from (11) and (12) cancel with analogous factors coming from automorphisms of C_e and its line bundles.

Now, suppose that C_e has a special point at only one of its ramification points. Then e is adjacent to an unstable vertex v, corresponding to a basepoint of $\vec{x}$ of order $\beta(v)$. The sections $\vec{x}$ still determine an underlying constant map to Z, so the universal family over the edge moduli space is still given by (10); the only difference in this situation is that the first universal line bundle is

$$\mathcal{L}_1 := \pi^*\mathcal{O}_Z(1) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}_e}(\beta(v)).$$

The same computations as previously show that the coordinates x and y on the $\mathbb{P}^1$ fibers of $\mathcal{C}_e$ can be described by sections of $\mathcal{O}_{C_e}(1)$ for which

$$x^{d(e)} = s \cdot \zeta_1, \quad y^{d(e)} = \zeta_2,$$

where $s \in \Gamma(\pi^*\mathcal{O}_Z(1))$, $\zeta_1 \in \Gamma(\mathcal{L}_1^\vee \otimes \mathcal{L}_2)$, and $\zeta_2 \in \Gamma(\mathcal{L}_2)$.

The normal directions to deformations of $\vec{x}$ are computed along the lines of [1]. Namely, the sections $\vec{x}$ must be of the form

$$\vec{x} = (c_1 x^{\beta(v)}, \ldots, c_{N+1} x^{\beta(v)})$$

for constants $(c_1, \ldots, c_{N+1}) \in \mathbb{C}^{N+1} \setminus 0$, and normal directions come from deforming the x_i away from such sections. These contribute

$$\prod_{a=1}^{\beta(v)} \left(H - \frac{a}{d(e)}(\lambda - H) \right)^{N+1} \tag{13}$$

to the Euler class of the virtual normal bundle.

There is also a part of the summand $\mathbb{E}$ in the obstruction theory (8) corresponding to the obstructions to moving the sections $\vec{x}$ away from $Z \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ yields a contribution of

$$e\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} R^0\pi_* \left(\mathcal{L}_1^{\otimes d_i} \right) \right) = e\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} \mathcal{O}_Z(d_i) \otimes R^0\pi_* \left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}_e}(d_i\beta(v)) \right) \right). \tag{14}$$

Again expressing sections of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}_e}(d_i\beta(v))$ in the coordinates $[x : y]$, we find that (14) contributes

$$\prod_{i=1}^{r} \prod_{a=0}^{d_i\beta(v)} \left(d_i H - \frac{a}{d(e)}(\lambda - H) \right), \tag{15}$$

to the virtual cycle.

Finally, a similar calculation to what we have done in the case of edges without basepoints shows that the moving part of $R\pi_*((\mathcal{L}_1^\vee \otimes$

$\mathcal{L}_2 \otimes \mathbb{C}_{(\lambda)}) \oplus \mathcal{L}_2)$ contributes

$$\prod_{b=1}^{d(e)-\beta(v)} \left(\frac{b}{d(e)}(\lambda - H)\right) \cdot \prod_{b=1}^{d(e)} \left(-\frac{b}{d(e)}(\lambda - H)\right)$$

to the Euler class of the virtual normal bundle.

Observe that the quotient of (15) by (13) is equal to the $q^{\beta(v)}$-coefficient in $z^{-1}J^{\epsilon}(q,z)$, under the substitution

$$z = \frac{\lambda - H}{d(e)}. \tag{16}$$

Furthermore, in the twisted ϵ-stable J-function, the twist in the $q^{\beta(v)}$-coefficient is

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{\mathbb{C}^*_\lambda \times \mathbb{C}^*_z}\left(R\pi_*(\mathcal{L}^\vee) \otimes \mathbb{C}_{(\lambda)}\right)^{-1} \\ =& e^{\mathbb{C}^*_\lambda \times \mathbb{C}^*_z}\left(\left(\mathcal{O}_Z(-1) \otimes \mathbb{C}_{(\lambda)}\right) \otimes -R\pi_*\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}}(-\beta(v))\right)\right) \\ =& \prod_{a=0}^{\beta(v)-1} (\lambda - H + az), \end{aligned}$$

which, under the substitution (16), becomes

$$\prod_{b=d(e)-\beta(v)-1}^{d(e)} \left(\frac{b}{d(e)}(\lambda - H)\right).$$

Thus, we can express the entire contribution of an edge e on which C_e has basepoints as

$$\frac{\left[z^{-1}J^{\epsilon,\mathrm{tw}}(q,z)\big|_{z=\frac{\lambda-H}{d(e)}}\right]_{q^{\beta(v)}}}{\prod_{b=1}^{d(e)} \left(\frac{b}{d(e)}(\lambda - H)\right) \prod_{b=1}^{d(e)} \left(-\frac{b}{d(e)}(\lambda - H)\right)},$$

where $[\cdot]_{q^\beta}$ denotes the q^β-coefficient of a power series in q.

Finally, we note that there are additional contributions to the virtual normal bundle from automorphisms of the edge components. The only such automorphisms with nontrivial torus weight come from moving an unmarked ramification point, which occurs if e is incident to an unstable vertex v of valence 1. Such a vertex contributes

$$\sigma(j(v))\frac{\lambda - H}{d(e(v))}$$

to the inverse Euler class of the virtual normal bundle, where

$$\sigma(j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j = 0 \\ -1 & \text{if } j = \infty \end{cases}$$

and $e(v)$ denotes the unique edge adjacent to v.

3.3.3. *Node contributions.* The deformations in $\mathcal{D}_{g,n,\beta,d}$ smoothing a node contribute to the Euler class of the virtual normal bundle as the first Chern class of the tensor product of the two cotangent line bundles at the branches of the node. For nodes at which a component C_e meets a component C_v, this contribution is

$$\sigma(j(v))\frac{\lambda - H}{d(e)} - \psi_v.$$

For nodes at which a component C_e meets a component C_v, the node-smoothing contribution is

$$\sigma(j(v))\left(\frac{\lambda - H}{d(e)} + \frac{\lambda - H}{d(e')}\right),$$

where v is the unstable vertex at which e and e' meet. To ease notation, we combine the above two situations by writing the contribution in either case as

$$-\psi - \psi',$$

where ψ and ψ' indicate the (equivariant) cotangent line classes at the two branches of the node.

As for the node contributions from the normalization exact sequence, each node q (specified by a vertex v) contributes

$$\left(R^0\pi_*(\mathcal{L}_1^\vee \otimes \mathcal{L}_2 \otimes \mathbb{C}_{(\lambda)})\right)\Big|_q \oplus R^0\pi_*(\mathcal{L}_2)\Big|_q. \tag{17}$$

In the case where $j(v) = 0$, the section z_2 is nonzero at q and gives a trivialization of $\mathcal{L}_2$. Thus, the second factor in (17) is trivial, while the Euler class of the first factor equals $\lambda - H$. In the case where $j(v) = \infty$, the section z_1 is nonzero at q and gives an isomorphism $\mathcal{L}_1 \cong \mathcal{L}_2$. Thus, after scaling the fibers of $\mathcal{L}_2$ with weight -1 to undo the action, the first factor in (17) is trivial and the Euler class of the second factor equals $-\lambda + H$.

In all, then, the normalization exact sequence at the node q contributes

$$\frac{1}{\sigma(j(v))(\lambda - H)}.$$

to the Euler class of the virtual normal bundle.

3.3.4. *Total fixed-locus contribution.* To state the final result, we introduce the notation

$$\widetilde{\lambda} := \lambda - H.$$

Then, combining all of the above computations, we find that for a graph Γ, the contribution $\iota_{\Gamma *}\left(\frac{[F_\Gamma]^{\mathrm{vir}}}{e(N_\Gamma^{\mathrm{vir}})}\right)$ of Γ to $[\mathbb{P}Z^\epsilon_{g,n,\beta,d}]^{\mathrm{vir}}$ equals:

$$\prod_{\substack{v \text{ stable} \\ j(v)=0}} [\overline{\mathcal{M}}^\epsilon_{g(v),\mathrm{val}(v)}(Z,\beta(v))]^{\mathrm{vir}}_{\mathrm{tw}} \cdot \prod_{\substack{v \text{ stable} \\ j(v)=\infty}} \frac{[\overline{\mathcal{M}}^\infty_{g(v),\mathrm{val}(v)}(Z,\beta(v))]^{\mathrm{vir}}}{e^{\mathbb{C}^*}\left(R\pi_*(\mathcal{L}) \otimes \mathbb{C}_{(-\lambda)}\right)}$$

$$\times \prod_e \prod_{b=1}^{d(e)} \left(-\frac{b}{d(e)}\widetilde{\lambda}^2\right)^{-1} \times \prod_{\substack{v \text{ unstable} \\ (g(v),j(v))=(0,\infty)}} \left(-\frac{\widetilde{\lambda}}{d(e(v))}\right)$$

$$\times \prod_{\substack{v \text{ unstable} \\ (g(v),j(v))=(0,0)}} \left[J^{\epsilon,\mathrm{tw}}(q,z)\Big|_{z=\frac{\widetilde{\lambda}}{d(e(v))}} \right]_{q^{\beta(v)}} \times \prod_{\text{nodes}} \frac{\sigma(j(v))\widetilde{\lambda}}{-\psi-\psi'},$$

Denoting the above by Contr_Γ, we have

$$[\mathbb{P}Z^\epsilon_{g,n,\beta,d}]^{\mathrm{vir}} = \sum_\Gamma \frac{1}{|\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)| \prod_e d(e)} \mathrm{Contr}_\Gamma.$$

4. Equivariant projective line

When $\beta = 0$, torus localization on the twisted graph space is closely related to localization on the moduli space of stable maps to $\mathbb{P}^1$. In this section, we perform explicit computations of generating series related to localization on $\mathbb{P}^1$, which play a role in the twisted graph space localization to follow.

First, note that the discussion in Section 3.2 can be specialized to the case when $N = 1$ and $r = 0$, in which case it recovers the Graber-Pandharipande localization formula for the Gromov–Witten theory of the projective line.

As in Section 3.2, the $\mathbb{C}^*$-fixed loci in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}(\mathbb{P}^1, d)$ can be indexed by n-legged graphs Γ, where each vertex v is decorated by an index $j(v) \in \{0,\infty\}$ and a genus $g(v)$, and each edge e is decorated by a degree $d(e) \in \mathbb{N}$. Each vertex v corresponds to a maximal sub-curve of genus $g(v)$ contracted to the single point $j(v) \in \mathbb{P}^1$, or, in the unstable case where the vertex has genus zero and valence one or two, to a single point in the source curve. Each edge e corresponds to a noncontracted component, which is necessarily of genus zero, and on which the map to $\mathbb{P}^1$ is of the form $[x : y] \mapsto [x^{d(e)} : y^{d(e)}]$ in coordinates.

Fix insertions $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in H^*_{\mathbb{C}^*}(\mathbb{P}^1)$, and let $p : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}(\mathbb{P}^1, d) \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ be the forgetful map. Then the localization formula expresses the class

$$p_* \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{ev}_i^*(\alpha_i) \cap [\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}(\mathbb{P}^1, d)]^{\mathrm{vir}} \right)$$

as a sum over contributions from each fixed-point graph Γ. These expressions can be stated more efficiently by considering the generating series

$$\sum_{d=0}^{\infty} y^d p_* \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{ev}_i^*(\alpha_i) \cap [\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}(\mathbb{P}^1, d)]^{\mathrm{vir}} \right) \tag{18}$$

for a Novikov variable y.

Let Φ_j denote the sum of all contributions to (18) from graphs Γ on which there is a vertex v with $g(v) = g$ and $j(v) = j$, and such that, after stabilization, the generic curve in the moduli space corresponding to Γ is smooth; the second condition means that there is no tree emanating from v which contains more than one marking. Therefore, emanating from the vertex v on such a graph, there are n (possibly empty) trees on which at least one marking lies and l trees with no marking, for some integer l. It follows that

$$\Phi_j = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{l!} \pi_{l*} \left(e_j \prod_{k=1}^{n} S_j(\alpha_k, \psi_k) \prod_{k=n+1}^{n+l} \epsilon_j(\psi_k) \right), \tag{19}$$

in which $\pi_l : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n+l} \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ denotes the forgetful map. Here,

$$e_j := \sum_{i=0}^{g} \lambda_i (\sigma(j)\lambda)^{g-1-i},$$

where λ_i is the ith Hodge class— that is, the ith Chern class of the Hodge bundle. The series $S_j(\alpha, z)$ in (19) is the universal generating series of localization contributions from trees emanating from a vertex v with $j(v) = j$ that contains exactly one of the markings and has an insertion of $\alpha \in H^*_{\mathbb{C}^*}(\mathbb{P}^1)$, and the series $\epsilon_j(z)$, similarly, is the generating series of localization contributions of a tree containing none of the markings.

Let $\overline{\psi}_k$ be the pullback under π_l of the class ψ_k on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$. It is well-known that $\overline{\psi}_k$ differs from ψ_k exactly on the boundary divisors of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ where the kth marking and some of the last l markings lie on a rational tail. By rewriting the classes $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n$ in terms of $\overline{\psi}_1, \dots, \overline{\psi}_n$ and boundary divisors, and for each summand integrating along the fibers

of the map forgetting all markings of the involved boundary divisors, we can rewrite Φ_j in the form

$$\Phi_j = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{l!} \pi_{l*} \left(e_j \prod_{k=1}^{n} \widetilde{S}_j(\alpha_k, \overline{\psi}_k) \prod_{k=n+1}^{n+l} \epsilon_j(\psi_k) \right)$$

for modified universal series $\widetilde{S}_j(\alpha, z)$. Surprisingly, the series $\widetilde{S}_j(\alpha, z)$ is easier to compute than $S_j(\alpha, z)$. In fact, it is closely related to the R-matrix for the equivariant Gromov–Witten theory of $\mathbb{P}^1$.

For the proof of Theorem 2.6, what is relevant from this formula is $\widetilde{S}_j(\alpha, 0)$. In fact, this contribution is related to the idempotents in the quantum cohomology ring of $\mathbb{P}^1$. Recall that the equivariant quantum cohomology of $\mathbb{P}^1$ is isomorphic to

$$\mathbb{C}[\lambda, H][\![y]\!]/(H(H-\lambda) - y),$$

where $H \in H^*_{\mathbb{C}^*}(\mathbb{P}^1)$ is the equivariant hyperplane class. It is easy to check that this ring is semisimple with idempotents e_0, e_∞ given by

$$e_0 = \frac{-\lambda/2 + \lambda/2\sqrt{\phi} + H}{\lambda\sqrt{\phi}}, \qquad e_\infty = \frac{\lambda/2 + \lambda/2\sqrt{\phi} - H}{\lambda\sqrt{\phi}},$$

where

$$\phi := 1 + \frac{4y}{\lambda^2}.$$

Lemma 4.1. *We have the identities*

$$\widetilde{S}_0(\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}^1}, 0) = \widetilde{S}_\infty(\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}^1}, 0) = \phi^{-1/4},$$
$$\widetilde{S}_0(H, 0) = \phi^{-1/4} \left(\frac{\lambda}{2} + \frac{\lambda}{2}\sqrt{\phi} \right),$$
$$\widetilde{S}_\infty(H, 0) = \phi^{-1/4} \left(\frac{\lambda}{2} - \frac{\lambda}{2}\sqrt{\phi} \right).$$

As a consequence of this lemma, we have

$$\frac{\widetilde{S}_0(H, 0)}{\widetilde{S}_0(\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}^1}, 0)} = \frac{\lambda}{2} + \frac{\lambda}{2}\sqrt{\phi}. \tag{20}$$

In particular, we note that this quantity is not a rational function of λ; this observation plays a key role in the proof of Theorem 2.6.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Let $\omega_{g,n}(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)$ be the part of (18) in cohomological degree zero. There are two ways of computing $\omega_{g,n}$: on the one hand, we can employ virtual localization, but on the other hand, we also know that the multilinear forms $\omega_{g,n}$ form a topological field theory, which is determined by the equivariant Poincaré pairing and the quantum product.

We first consider the computation of the degree-zero part of (18) via localization. In fact, $\omega_{g,n}(\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_n)$ equals the degree-zero part of $\Phi_0+\Phi_\infty$, because all localization graphs which do neither contribute to Φ_0 or Φ_∞ give rise to a contribution supported on a nontrivial stratum of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$. Using that the Hodge bundle has rank g, we see that $\omega_{g,n}(\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_n)$ equals the degree zero part of

$$\sum_{j\in\{0,\infty\}}\sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{l!}\pi_{l*}\left((\sigma(j)\lambda)^{g-1}\prod_{k=1}^{n}\widetilde{S}_j(\alpha_k,\overline{\psi}_k)\prod_{k=n+1}^{n+l}\epsilon_j(\psi_k)\right). \tag{21}$$

By repeated application of the string equation for the last l arguments (moving along the string flow), one can rewrite this in the form

$$\sum_{j\in\{0,\infty\}}\sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{l!}\pi_{l*}\left((\sigma(j)\lambda)^{g-1}\prod_{k=1}^{n}\widetilde{S}_j(\alpha_k,\overline{\psi}_k)\prod_{k=n+1}^{n+l}\widetilde{\epsilon}_j(\psi_k)\right),$$

where $\widetilde{\epsilon}_j$ is a new universal series such that $\widetilde{\epsilon}_j(0)=0$. So,

$$\begin{aligned}&\omega_{g,n}(\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_n)\\ &\qquad=\sum_{j\in\{0,\infty\}}\sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{l!}\pi_{l*}\left((\sigma(j)\lambda)^{g-1}\prod_{k=1}^{n}\widetilde{S}_j(\alpha_k,\overline{\psi}_k)\prod_{k=n+1}^{n+l}\widetilde{\epsilon}_j^{1}\psi_k\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{\epsilon}_j^{1}$ is the linear coefficient in z of $\widetilde{\epsilon}_j$. Finally, by the dilaton equation,

$$\omega_{g,n}(\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_n)=\sum_{j\in\{0,\infty\}}(\sigma(j)\lambda)^{g-1}(1-\widetilde{\epsilon}_j^{1})^{-(2g-2+n)}\prod_{i=1}^{n}\widetilde{S}_j(\alpha_k,0). \tag{22}$$

It is useful to note that the tree series satisfy

$$\epsilon_j|_{y=0}=\widetilde{\epsilon}_j|_{y=0}=0, \tag{23}$$

since a localization tree containing no marking needs to carry a positive degree. Since for $y=0$ the quantum idempotents e_0 and e_∞ recover the classical idempotents, and the only contributions to S_0 or S_∞ in degree zero come from empty trees, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{S}_0(e_0,0)|_{y=0}&=\widetilde{S}_\infty(e_\infty,0)|_{y=0}=1,\\ \widetilde{S}_0(e_\infty,0)|_{y=0}&=\widetilde{S}_\infty(e_0,0)|_{y=0}=0.\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

We now compare (22) to explicit expressions of the topological field theory. First, consider the case $n=0$. Since the norms of the idempotents e_0 and e_∞ are given by $\lambda^{-1}\phi^{-1/2}$ and $-\lambda^{-1}\phi^{-1/2}$, respectively, we

have

$$\omega_{g,0}() = \lambda^{g-1}\phi^{\frac{g-1}{2}} + (-\lambda)^{g-1}\phi^{\frac{g-1}{2}}.$$

Comparing this to (22) (note that both hold for any g) and using (23), we see that we must have

$$1 - \widetilde{\epsilon}_0^1 = 1 - \widetilde{\epsilon}_\infty^1 = \phi^{-\frac{1}{4}}.$$

The trilinear form $\omega_{0,3}$ is given by quantum multiplication and application of the equivariant Poincaré pairing. It is easy to compute that

$$\omega_{0,3}(e_{i_1}, e_{i_2}, e_{i_3}) = \delta_{i_1=i_2=i_3}\sigma(i_1)\lambda^{-1}\phi^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

With (22), this gives the equations

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda^{-1}\phi^{\frac{1}{4}}(\widetilde{S}_0(e_0,0))^3 - \lambda^{-1}\phi^{\frac{1}{4}}(\widetilde{S}_\infty(e_0,0))^3 &= \lambda^{-1}\phi^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\
\lambda^{-1}\phi^{\frac{1}{4}}(\widetilde{S}_0(e_0,0))^2(\widetilde{S}_0(e_\infty,0)) - \lambda^{-1}\phi^{\frac{1}{4}}(\widetilde{S}_\infty(e_0,0))^2(S_\infty e_\infty) &= 0 \\
\lambda^{-1}\phi^{\frac{1}{4}}(\widetilde{S}_0(e_0,0))(\widetilde{S}_0(e_\infty,0))^2 - \lambda^{-1}\phi^{\frac{1}{4}}(\widetilde{S}_\infty(e_0,0))(\widetilde{S}_\infty(e_\infty,0))^2 &= 0 \\
\lambda^{-1}\phi^{\frac{1}{4}}(\widetilde{S}_0(e_\infty,0))^3 - \lambda^{-1}\phi^{\frac{1}{4}}(\widetilde{S}_\infty(e_\infty,0))^3 &= -\lambda^{-1}\phi^{-\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

It is not difficult to see that the only solutions to these equations together with (24) are

$$\widetilde{S}_0(e_0,0) = \widetilde{S}_\infty(e_\infty,0) = \phi^{-\frac{1}{4}}, \qquad \widetilde{S}_0(e_\infty,0) = \widetilde{S}_\infty(e_0,0) = 0.$$

With the identities

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}^1} = e_0 + e_\infty, \qquad H = \left(\frac{\lambda}{2} + \frac{\lambda}{2}\sqrt{\phi}\right)e_0 + \left(\frac{\lambda}{2} - \frac{\lambda}{2}\sqrt{\phi}\right)e_\infty,$$

the lemma easily follows. □

5. Proof of Theorem 2.6

We are now ready to turn to the proof of the main theorem. The basic structure of the proof is to compute the difference between the expression

$$\sum_{\beta,d} q^\beta y^d p_*\left(\mathrm{ev}_1^*(\alpha) \cap [\mathbb{P}Z^\epsilon_{g,n,\beta,d}]^{\mathrm{vir}}\right) \tag{25}$$

and the expression

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_d y^d p_* \Bigg(\sum_{k=0}^\infty \sum_{\beta_0,\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_k} \frac{q^{\beta_0} b_{\vec{\beta}*}}{k!} \Bigg(& \mathrm{ev}_1^*(\alpha) \cup \\
& \prod_{i=1}^k q^{\beta_i}\, \mathrm{ev}_{n+i}^*((\lambda - H)^{-1}\iota_{[0]}^*\mu_{\beta_i}^{\epsilon,\mathrm{tw}}(-\psi_{n+i})) \cap [\mathbb{P}Z^\infty_{g,n,\beta,d}]^{\mathrm{vir}} \Bigg)\Bigg),
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

by localization on the twisted graph space. Here,

$$p : \mathbb{P}Z^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta,d} \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)$$

is the morphism forgetting L_2, z_1, and z_2 (and stabilizing as necessary). The insertion α is an element of $\{\mathbf{1}, H\}$, $\iota_{[0]}$ is the inclusion of the zero section into $\mathbb{P}Z$, and $\mu^{\epsilon,\mathrm{tw}}$ is the twisted mirror transformation defined by (5). Using only the fact that the difference between (25) and (26) is a Laurent polynomial in the equivariant parameter, we prove Theorem 2.9, and by Lemma 2.10, this implies Theorem 2.6.

5.1. **Multilinear forms.** First, we set up some useful notation and observations.

Define

$$(\ )^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta} : \mathcal{H}[\![\psi]\!]^n \to H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta))$$

by

$$(\phi_1,\dots,\phi_n)^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta} = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{ev}_i^*(\phi_i)(\psi_i) \cap [\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)]^{\mathrm{vir}}_{\mathrm{tw}},$$

define

$$(\ )^{\infty\to\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta} : \mathcal{H}[\![\psi]\!]^n \to H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta))$$

by

$$\sum_{\beta} q^{\beta}\,(\phi_1,\dots,\phi_n)^{\infty\to\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta} = \sum_{k,\beta_0,\beta_1,\dots,\beta_k} \frac{q^{\beta_0}}{k!} b_{\vec{\beta}*} c_* \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{ev}_i^*(\phi_i)(\psi_i) \cup \prod_{i=1}^{k} q^{\beta_i}\,\mathrm{ev}_{n+i}^*(\mu^{\epsilon,\mathrm{tw}}_{\beta_i}(-\psi_{n+i})) \cap [\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\infty}_{g,n+k}(Z,\beta_0)]^{\mathrm{vir}}_{\mathrm{tw}} \right),$$

and define

$$(\ )^{\mathrm{WC}}_{g,n,\beta} : \mathcal{H}[\![\psi]\!]^n \to H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta))$$

by

$$(\phi_1,\dots,\phi_n)^{\mathrm{WC}}_{g,n,\beta} = (\phi_1,\dots,\phi_n)^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta} - (\phi_1,\dots,\phi_n)^{\infty\to\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta}\,.$$

Then Theorem 2.9 is equivalent to the statement that the form $(\ )^{\mathrm{WC}}_{g,n,\beta}$ vanishes when all insertions lie in $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}[\![\psi]\!]$. In fact, we need only verify this vanishing when $\phi_i = \mathbf{1}$ for each i:

Lemma 5.1. *The equation*

$$(\phi_1,\dots,\phi_n)^{WC}_{g,n,\beta} = 0$$

holds for any $\phi_1,\dots,\phi_n \in \mathcal{H}$ if and only if

$$(\mathbf{1},\dots,\mathbf{1})^{WC}_{g,n,\beta} = 0. \tag{27}$$

Thus, Theorem 2.6 is equivalent to (27).

Proof. This follows from the fact that the evaluation maps at the first n marked points, as well as the psi-classes, are compatible with $b_{\vec{\beta}}$. □

5.2. **Proof of Theorem 2.9.** We prove the vanishing of $(\mathbf{1},\dots,\mathbf{1})^{\mathrm{WC}}_{g,n,\beta}$, and thus Theorem 2.9, by induction on β. When $\beta = 0$, there is nothing to prove, since $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,0) = \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\infty}_{g,n}(Z,0)$. Supposing that $(\mathbf{1},\dots,\mathbf{1})^{\mathrm{WC}}_{g,n,\beta} = 0$ has been shown for all $\beta' < \beta$ (and all g and n), we prove that $(\mathbf{1},\dots,\mathbf{1})^{\mathrm{WC}}_{g,n,\beta} = 0$ by induction on g and n (as long as the moduli space $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)$ exists and $n \geq 1$).

Denote by

$$D_\beta(\lambda, y) \in H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta))[\lambda,\lambda^{-1}][\![y]\!].$$

the coefficient of q^β in the difference between (25) and (26). Note that both (25) and (26) can be computed by localization on the respective twisted graph spaces. Moreover, the graphs indexing fixed loci appearing in (25) and the graphs indexing fixed loci appearing in (26) differ in only two ways: the latter have k additional legs distributed among the vertices with $j(v) = 0$, and they have less degree β_0 on the vertices. The map $b_{\vec{\beta}}$ induces a surjection from the latter graphs to the former, for which $\beta(v)$ on the image of a vertex v is given by the sum of $\beta(v)$ and all β_i such that the $(n+i)$th leg lies on v. Thus, we can express $D_\beta(\lambda, y)$ as a sum over the graphs Γ indexing fixed loci in $\mathbb{P}Z^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta,d}$.

Let Γ be such a graph, and suppose that there are at least two vertices of positive degree. For any vertex v such that $j(v) = \infty$, the contributions of v to (25) and (26) are identical, and the contributions from each edge are also the same. Thus, the only possibly non-identical contributions come from vertices v with $j(v) = 0$.

Let us first consider vertices v with $j(v) = 0$ that are unstable of genus 0 and valence 1. The contribution of such vertices to the localization formula for (25) is given by the coefficient of $q^{\beta(v)}$ in

$$J^{\epsilon,\mathrm{tw}}(q,z)\Big|_{z=\frac{\widetilde{\lambda}}{d(e(v))}},$$

where we again use the notation $\widetilde{\lambda} := \lambda - H$. The corresponding contributions to (26) (after forgetting about the additional markings

at v) are given by

$$\delta_{\beta(v),0}\frac{\widetilde{\lambda}}{d(e(v))} + \mu^{\epsilon,\mathrm{tw}}_{\beta(v)}\left(\frac{\widetilde{\lambda}}{d(e(v))}\right)$$
$$+ \sum_{\substack{k\geq 1,\beta_0+\cdots+\beta_k=\beta(v)\\ k+\beta_0>1}} \mathrm{ev}_{1,*}\left(\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{k}\mathrm{ev}_{i+1}^*\left(\mu^{\epsilon,\mathrm{tw}}_{\beta_i}(-\psi_{i+1})\right)}{\left(\frac{\widetilde{\lambda}}{d(e(v))}-\psi_1\right)k!}\cap[\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\infty}_{0,1+k}(Z,\beta_0)]^{\mathrm{vir}}_{\mathrm{tw}}\right)$$
$$= J^{\infty,\mathrm{tw}}\left(q,\sum_{\beta}q^{\beta}\mu^{\epsilon,\mathrm{tw}}_{\beta}(-z),z\right)\Big|_{z=\frac{\widetilde{\lambda}}{d(e(v))}},$$

where the first two summands correspond to the cases when v is unstable and the last summand corresponds to the case when v is stable. By the J-function wall-crossing (6), these contributions to (25) and (26) are identical.

For stable vertices with $j(v)=0$, on the other hand, the twisted wall-crossing holds in degree $\beta(v)<\beta$ by induction. This says precisely that the contributions to (25) and (26) from such vertices also agree.

Thus,[4] we have shown that the contributions to (25) and (26) agree whenever there are two vertices of positive degree, so we have expressed $D_\beta(\lambda,y)$ as a sum over contributions from graphs Γ in which there is exactly one vertex v_0 with $\beta(v_0)=\beta$ and all other vertices have degree zero. (Note that in the contributions to (26) from such a graph, the last k markings must all lie at v_0.) By induction on the genus, we can assume that $g(v_0)=g$. Similarly to the situation in Section 4, there are m trees emanating from v_0 on which at least one of the markings $q_1,\dots,q_n$ lies, and l unmarked trees. By induction on the number n of marked points, we may restrict attention only to those graphs Γ for which each of the marked points $q_1,\dots,q_n$ lies on a separate (possibly empty) tree emanating from v_0.

Note that since $\beta(v)=0$ for all vertices of the trees, the localization contribution of such trees is identical to those for discussed in Section 4, except that we should replace λ by $\widetilde{\lambda}$. Thus, if

$$\pi_l : \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n+l}(Z,\beta)\to\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)$$

[4]Here, we are using the using the splitting property satisfied by the quasimap virtual fundamental class (see [7, Section 2.3.3]).

denotes the forgetful map, $D_\beta(\lambda, y)$ is expressed as

$$D_\beta(\lambda, y) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{l!} \pi_{l*} \left(g_1(\psi), \ldots, g_n(\psi), \epsilon'(\psi), \ldots, \epsilon'(\psi) \right)^{\mathrm{WC}}_{g,n+l,\beta}$$

where

$$g_i(z) = \begin{cases} S_0(\alpha, z)|_{\lambda=\widetilde{\lambda}} & \text{if } i = 1, \\ S_0(\mathbf{1}, z)|_{\lambda=\widetilde{\lambda}} & \text{if } i \geq 1, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\epsilon'(z) = \epsilon(z)|_{\lambda=\widetilde{\lambda}}.$$

As in Section 4, we rewrite this by expressing the ψ-classes at the first n markings in terms of the ψ-classes $\overline{\psi}_j$ which are pulled back under π_l. Note that the classes ψ_j and $\overline{\psi_j}$ differ exactly on the locus of curves with a rational component of degree $\beta = 0$ containing marking j and some of the markings $n+1, \ldots, n+l$. Hence, expressing the ψ-classes in terms of the pullback ψ-classes formally works in the same way as for $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$, and one obtains

$$D_\beta(\lambda, y) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{l!} \pi_{l*} \left(\widetilde{g}_1(\overline{\psi}), \ldots, \widetilde{g}_n(\overline{\psi}), \epsilon'(\psi), \ldots, \epsilon'(\psi) \right)^{\mathrm{WC}}_{g,n+l,\beta},$$

where

$$\widetilde{g}_i(z) = \widetilde{S}_0(\alpha_i, z)|_{\lambda=\widetilde{\lambda}},$$

and $\overline{\psi}^k$ is a symbol that should be replaced by the pullback ψ-class $\overline{\psi}_j^k$ in position j.

We define

$$U_{l,k} \in \mathcal{H}^{\otimes l}[\widetilde{\lambda}, \widetilde{\lambda}^{-1}][\![y, \psi]\!]$$

such that

$$\sum_{k=-l}^{\infty} U_{l,k} = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{l!} \epsilon'(\psi) \otimes \cdots \otimes \epsilon'(\psi) \in \mathcal{H}^{\otimes l}[\widetilde{\lambda}, \widetilde{\lambda}^{-1}][\![y, \psi]\!],$$

and such that $U_{l,k}$ is homogeneous of degree $k+l$ for the grading where $\deg(y) = \deg(\lambda) = 0$ and $\deg(H) = \deg(\overline{\psi}) = 1$. So, slightly abusing notation, we can write

$$D_\beta(\lambda, y) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=-l}^{\infty} \pi_{l*} \left(\widetilde{g}_1(\overline{\psi}), \ldots, \widetilde{g}_n(\overline{\psi}), U_{l,k} \right)^{\mathrm{WC}}_{g,n+l,\beta}. \tag{28}$$

We now claim that, for any non-positive k, the wall-crossing formula

$$\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \pi_{l*} \left(\mathbf{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{1}, U_{l,k} \right)^{\mathrm{WC}}_{g,n+l,\beta} = 0 \tag{29}$$

holds.

The proof of (29) is by induction on k, using that (28) is a Laurent polynomial in λ for any choice of the insertion α. The claim is trivially true for k sufficiently small, since the left-hand side of (29) lives in

$$H_{2(\mathrm{vdim}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta))-k)}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)),$$

which is trivial when $\mathrm{vdim}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta))-k$ is bigger than the dimension of all components of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)$.

Now, suppose the claim holds for all $k < k_0$. This implies that all summands of (28) with $k < k_0$ vanish, since $\mathbf{1}$ differs from $\widetilde{g}_j(\overline{\psi}_j)$ only by a factor pulled back from $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)$. It follows that the highest possible dimension of a summand is

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta) - k_0, \tag{30}$$

and this dimension is achieved only in the $k = k_0$ term from taking the coefficient of z^0H^0 for each $\widetilde{g}_j(z)$. It follows that

$$\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \pi_{l*}\left(\widetilde{S}_0(\alpha,0), \widetilde{S}_0(\mathbf{1},0), \dots, \widetilde{S}_0(\mathbf{1},0), U_{l,k_0}\right)^{\mathrm{WC}}_{g,n+l,\beta} \tag{31}$$

is a Laurent polynomial in λ.

The crucial point, now, is that the above is true for either choice of the insertion $\alpha \in \{\mathbf{1}, H\}$. By (20), changing α from $\mathbf{1}$ to H causes $\widetilde{g}_1(0)$ to change by a factor of

$$\frac{\lambda}{2} + \frac{\lambda}{2}\sqrt{1 + \frac{4y}{\lambda^2}}. \tag{32}$$

Since (32) has infinitely many negative powers when expanded as a Laurent series in λ, this is only possible if (31) is identically zero. Dividing (31) for $\alpha = \mathbf{1}$ by $\phi^{-n/4}$ (see Lemma 4.1) completes the induction step for the proof of (29).

Remark 5.2. Note that the assumption of one marked point is necessary at this stage of the proof, in order to vary the insertion α. One might hope to remove this assumption, but in order for the unmarked wall-crossing to appear in the localization formula for the twisted graph space $\mathbb{P}Z^{\epsilon}_{g,n,\beta,d}$, we would need a localization graph consisting of exactly one vertex v, which has $j(v) = 0$. Such a graph exists only when $d = 0$, but in this case the virtual dimension of the twisted graph space is $g + \beta - 1$ less than the virtual dimension of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon}_{g,n}(Z,\beta)$, so when $g > 0$ or $\beta > 0$ we cannot expect to obtain any relations from localization.

Since $\epsilon'(\psi)|_{y=0} = 0$, the y^0-coefficient of (29) for $k = 0$ gives exactly the wall-crossing formula. This completes the induction step, and hence the proof of Theorem 2.9.

References

[1] A. Bertram. Another way to enumerate rational curves with torus actions. *Invent. Math.*, 142(3):487–512, 2000.

[2] H.-L. Chang, J. Li, W.-P. Li, and M. Liu. Mixed-spin-p fields of Fermat quintic polynomials. arXiv:1505.07532, 2015.

[3] H.-L. Chang, J. Li, W.-P. Li, and M. Liu. An effective theory of GW and FJRW invariants of quintic Calabi–Yau manifolds. arXiv:1603.06184, 2016.

[4] A. Chiodo and Y. Ruan. Landau–Ginzburg/Calabi–Yau correspondence for quintic three-folds via symplectic transformations. *Invent. math.*, 182(1):117–165, 2010.

[5] A. Chiodo and D. Zvonkine. Twisted Gromov-Witten r-spin potential and Givental's quantization. arXiv:0711.0339, 2007.

[6] I. Ciocan-Fontanine and B. Kim. Moduli stacks of stable toric quasimaps. *Adv. in Math.*, 225(6):3022–3051, 2010.

[7] I. Ciocan-Fontanine and B. Kim. Higher-genus quasimap wall-crossing for semi-positive targets. arXiv:1308.6377, 2013.

[8] I. Ciocan-Fontanine and B. Kim. Big I-functions. arXiv:1401.7417, 2014.

[9] I. Ciocan-Fontanine and B. Kim. Wall-crossing in genus zero quasimap theory and mirror maps. *Algebr. Geom.*, 1(4):400–448, 2014.

[10] I. Ciocan-Fontanine and B. Kim. Quasimap wall-crossings and mirror symmetry. arXiv:1611.05023, 2016.

[11] I. Ciocan-Fontanine, B. Kim, and D. Maulik. Stable quasimaps to GIT quotients. arXiv:1106.3724, 2011.

[12] E. Clader, F. Janda, and Y. Ruan. Wall-crossing in higher-genus Landau–Ginzburg theory for the quintic threefold. In preparation.

[13] H. Fan, T. Jarvis, and Y. Ruan. A mathematical theory of the gauged linear sigma model. arXiv:1506.02109, 2015.

[14] A. Givental. Equivariant Gromov-Witten invariants. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, 1996(13):613–663, 1996.

[15] A. Givental. Elliptic Gromov-Witten invariants and the generalized mirror conjecture. In *Integrable systems and algebraic geometry (Kobe/Kyoto, 1997)*, pages 107–155. World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1998.

[16] A. Givental. A mirror theorem for toric complete intersections. *Progr. Math.*, 160:141–176, 1998.

[17] T. Graber and R. Pandharipande. Localization of virtual classes. *Invent. math.*, 135(2):487–518, 1999.

[18] S. Guo and D. Ross. Genus-one global mirror theorem for the quintic threefold. In preparation.

[19] S. Guo and D. Ross. Genus-one mirror symmetry and the Landau–Ginzburg model. arXiv:1611.08876, 2016.

[20] B. Kim and H. Lho. Mirror theorem for elliptic quasimap invariants. arXiv:1506.03196, 2015.

[21] A. Marian, D. Oprea, and R. Pandharipande. The moduli space of stable quotients. *Geom. Topol.*, 15(3):1651–1706, 2011.
[22] A. Musta¸tă and M. A. Musta¸tă. Intermediate moduli spaces of stable maps. *Invent. Math.*, 167(1):47–90, 2007.
[23] D. Ross and Y. Ruan. Wall-crossing in genus zero Landau-Ginzburg theory. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* (in press), arXiv:1402.6688, 2014.
[24] Y. Toda. Moduli spaces of stable quotients and wall-crossing phenomena. *Compos. Math.*, 147(5):1479–1518, 2011.

Department of Mathematics, San Francisco State University, 1600 Holloway Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94132, USA
E-mail address: eclader@sfsu.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of Michigan, 2074 East Hall, 530 Church Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA
E-mail address: janda@umich.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of Michigan, 2074 East Hall, 530 Church Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA
E-mail address: ruan@umich.edu